

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Mary Sequin

v.

Case No. 13-cv-12-SJM-LM

Textron, Inc., et al.

**O R D E R**

After due consideration of the objection filed, I herewith approve the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Landya B. McCafferty dated October 17, 2013, for the reasons set forth therein. In addition, to the extent plaintiff has included multiple distinct motions for relief of various kinds in her objection the Report and Recommendation, those motions are all denied without prejudice.

I hereby grant the defendants' motions for a temporary stay (document nos. 69, 73, 109, and 119) and I am imposing, in this case, a limited filing restriction upon the plaintiff, as set forth below:

1. Plaintiff is ordered to cease filing any motions, pleadings, notices, or other documents after the date of this order, until the district court rules on each pending motion to dismiss (document nos. 89 and 91-93), except as follows:

a. Plaintiff may file one objection or other response to each motion filed by defendants while this filing restriction remains in effect, within the time allowed by LR Cv 7(b);

b. Plaintiff may file one objection to each of defendants' September 6, 2013, motions to dismiss (document nos. 89 and 91-93) while this filing

restriction remains in effect, within the time allowed by the court for filing that objection;

c. If the magistrate judge issues a report and recommendation on each pending motion to dismiss (document nos. 89 and 91-93), plaintiff may file on objection to each report and recommendation and one response to any other party's objection, as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b);

d. If the magistrate judge issues an order as to any nondispositive matter while this filing restriction remains in effect, plaintiff may file one objection to that order and one response to any other party's objection, as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and LR Cv 72.2;

e. Plaintiff may file a motion to extend the deadlines set forth herein, demonstrating good cause for extending those deadlines, and


f. Plaintiff may file a motion seeking the court's leave to file another document, in accordance with Paragraph 2 below.

2. Except as to the motions, objections, and responses listed in Paragraphs 1(a)-(f) of this order, which plaintiff may file without first seeking the court's leave, while this filing restriction remains in effect, this court may summarily deny any motion and/or strike any document filed by plaintiff, unless plaintiff simultaneously files a motion seeking the court's leave to file that document or motion. In her motion seeking such leave to file, plaintiff must demonstrate the basis upon which she asserts a right or need to file the document/motion at issue, and she must attach the document/motion she proposes to file as an exhibit to the motion requesting leave.

3. Unless otherwise ordered by this court, defendants need not respond to any notice, pleading, or motion currently pending, or filed by plaintiff after the date of this order, while this filing restriction remains in effect.

4. Unless otherwise ordered by this court, the conditions and restrictions set forth in Paragraphs 1-3 of this order shall be terminated when the district judge either rules on each motion to dismiss (document nos. 89 and 91-93), or accepts, rejects, or modifies the magistrate judge's report and recommendation on each of those motions to dismiss, whichever occurs first.

SO ORDERED.

  
Steven J. McAuliffe  
United States District Judge

November 6, 2013

cc: Mary Seguin, pro se  
Rebecca T. Partington, Esq.  
Susan Urso, Esq.  
Erika J. Lindberg, Esq.  
Mark W. Freel, Esq.  
Rachel K. Caldwell, Esq.  
Joseph Avanzato, Esq.  
Leslie D. Parker, Esq.  
Gordon P. Cleary, Esq.